. . . . The 156th meeting of the CIA RETIREMENT BOARD convened at 2:00 p.m. on Thursday, 15 April 1971, with the following present:

Mr. Harry B. Fisher, Chairman

Guests:

25X1A9a

Mr. Howard J. Osborn, Director of Security, on behalf of ILLEGIB

MR. FISHER: I thought I'd bring this in - it's a clipping from the Evening Star of April 14th, and this is the first one I've seen that says Congress is really going to try to get the cost of living approval before May 31st.

25X1A9a

I thought it was in the bag.

MR. FISHER: It has been back and forth. We are in touch with Andy Ruddock, who is the sponsor, and he himself has vacillated a bit. His whole intent for introducing this was to get it past this session in time for the May-- And then he said it looked like he couldn't possibly get it in in time.

25X1A9a

3

This still wouldn't apply to CIARDS,

would it?

MR. FISHER: No, but to a large number of Civil
Service people, who are indecisive enough, anyhow. Of course after
April 22 people will then know whether the cost of living went through
and can then really zero in on whether to retire by May 31st.

There's even a statement in this article that if it doesn't make it by May 31st they could make it retroactive. So they would be in the position of gambling and staying until June and July.

Well, it isn't a critical thing, really.

25X1A9a

There is no way the CIARDS can get

tied in with this while it's being considered?

25X1A9a

No. We tried. It was rejected.

MR. FISHER: Charlie, we got the usual answer.

You know, the obvious way of doing it would be to get a little rider on this one saying this includes CIA too. And the answer - which has been a consistent one, going back as far as we all can remember, is - "We cannot afford a precedent of CIA legislation being introduced in the House Civil Service and Post Office Committee. This is a prerogative of our Committee." So they won't buy it, even though they see the wisdom in this particular case.

25X1A9a

They wouldn't take a bill themselves,

tying it into this one?

MR. FISHER: By the time we knew about it - and starting from scratch, we could never get our own bill in in time to be passed by May 31st. And again, it isn't that critical, but I have asked OLC to start preparing comparable legislation. If it goes through I'm sure - well, I can't say I'm sure, but we will try to have it in in time for the next cost of living increase. I might add that there are those who still don't think this is a great idea and that having a firm date by which they all go out is a good idea.

Now, we have a couple of fellows waiting outside to come before the Board -- and Howard Osborn will be coming in, too -- so let me just skip items 1 and 2 for the moment and go to the case of 25X1A9a

This is a 15th year review and the man needs one month and 22 days. He speaks of AQUATONE and the sensitivity of the project. Of course I'm going to have to explain to him, as I do to all of them, that sensitivity does not in and of itself do it but that it's what did you really do. He is not retiring. He is a pretty young fellow -

SEGRET

he is only 45 years old -- and he needs another four years or so for having the 25 years of service, so he couldn't retire yet. So it's just a question of getting into CIARDS now, and he is going to try to explain to us what was his qualifying service.

25X1A9a Oh, is he the witness?

MR. FISHER: Yes.

25X1A6a of his memo, because that time I have verified and that is included in his overseas service now.

MR. FISHER: But he still needs one month and 22

And disregard that paragraph 3

25X1A9a Right.

25X1A9a then joined the meeting to speak to the Board in his own behalf

25X1A6a

25X1A9a

days?

MR. FISHER:

I don't want to sound

as negative as I probably will, but I have to present it this way so that you

will see what we do need for you to get qualifying service. The degree of

sensitivity of the project has really nothing to do with domestic

qualifying service, because so many people here are involved in extremely

sensitive things. We are looking for hazard or a true requirement to

practice tradecraft to maintain your cover, which normally to our minds

means you were making contact with the outside world - usually with

foreign agents - in safe houses, using aliases, the type of tradecraft

techniques that are typical of the Clandestine Services.

So, within those guidelines, or whatever you want to tell us, we would like to see what it is that you did in AQUATONE that qualifies you for the CIARDS.

25X1A9a

Well, as far as the domestic

Next 9 Page(s) In Document Exempt

SECTET

paragraph you say: "Inasmuch as the nature of my work precludes any discussion and demands that I should and must maintain cover, in deference to this I have severely limited my social, church and civic activities."

Would you expand on that?

25X1A9a

Only so that I don't expose myself

to questions, I don't socialize unnecessarily. The job I think is selfexplanatory. I am the custodian of the names and the records of all of
the agents used by the Clandestine Services throughout the world. This
is my job. We process these people for approval of their use in
clandestine operations throughout the world. We have

25X9A2
names on file of people that have been used and are being used today, and
are being considered for use, and I just don't expose myself unnecessarily
to questions or anything else that relates to this.

25X1A9a Well, fine. Does this pose a particular burden on you in your relationships--

25X1A9a I am not complaining about it, I'm just explaining it, that's all.

25X1A9a But my question was did it put a burden on you in terms of your social and civic activities.

25X1A

ILLEGIB

I think only in that I try to limit my social acquaintances to people that I can be as free with as possible, and mainly those are Agency people because they know you can't talk and they don't ask embarrassing questions. I do have friends who were former AID associates when I was overseas with AID -- and that just carries on without any problem - they accept me and don't ask any questions. I would say that it is a burden in a sense, yes, but not one that I'm complaining about.

MR. FISHER: Probably no more of a burden than to most anyone under cover here in the Agency.

Next 5 Page(s) In Document Exempt

one of his statements, where he says, "Because of this infirmity, I have been at a distinct disadvantage in attempting to secure employment in my specialized fields after retirement."

MR. OSBORN: I don't agree with that at all. No. I'm just levelling with you.

MR. FISHER: Well, I think, too, Oz, that in your office you have a lot of fellows that are getting along in years and you have a lot of bright young guys coming along, and in your kind of business you should keep them moving --

MR. OSBORN: I couldn't begin to recommend this extension if it were not for Frank's condition. I told him I'd have to treat him the same as everybody else and unless there is some additional factor-- And in his case I think there is.

MR. FISHER: Well, even at that I do feel that it's pretty hard to blame the fact that we have let this come right down to the wire--

MR. OSBORN: The reason we have let it come right down to the wire is because we have all been trying to convince him to retire.

MR. FISHER: Well, I assume he will realize that after this action, though, the next one will be a termination action.

MR. OSBORN: Oh absolutely! No, no. We could fire him--

MR. FISHER: As a matter of fact, we will probably be asking you to get a signed application for retirement from him.

MR. OSBORN: We would be glad to do that.

You are assuming the Board is going

to go along with it--

25X1A9a

ILLEGIB

MR. FISHER: We need a signed application for retirement, regardless--

21

Next 21 Page(s) In Document Exempt

might add that I have a revised statement on a buck sheet from the DDS

ILLEGIB that just arrived. And I'm sure you noted that this had been signed as a nonconcurrence on 25 March -- but now this is being changed.

(Reading)

"While on the surface the circumstances of this case would seem to make the request counter to the ExDir comments on the extensions for irreplaceability, I am persuaded by information now provided by the Director of Logistics that in fact the circumstances necessitating this request could not have been anticipated. I therefore urge affirmative action on the part of the Retirement Board."

25X1A9a

We are not going to be told why?

MR. FISHER: Well, in a sense, I started this whole thing. Because when I read it -- and knowing a little bit about this girl -- I called Jack Blake, and he didn't know yet that it had not been concurred in, and he went through the roof. He said - "That's ridiculous! I'm asking for this extension because a whole bunch of key people are moving out at the same time, and this woman would provide the continuity that I need here for about five more months -- is that so terrible?"

25X1A9a

Except that Jack has known for some time that all of this was coming at him.

MR. FISHER: No he didn't. A couple of guys

decided to retire earlier than they were supposed to -- and another one
had to be sent overseas

- and suddenly he was left with this.

So he's asking for five more months for this woman. He didn't think it
was so terrible. And she herself is not asking for it, he's saying. So
he said to stand down on it until he could get back

or Wattles

-25X1A

and he convinced Wattles to reverse his negative on this.

25X1A9a

Well, there isn't much left for us

to do, is there.

25X1A

SEGRET

25X1A9a

Chauffeurs and telephone operators.

MR. FISHER: Well, do I have a motion on this one?

I think we should go along with it. Second.

... This motion was then passed ...

MR. FISHER: Let the record show that because of some unanticipated departures at this particular time, continuity is required by the Director of Logistics.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

both 15th anniversary reviews and in both cases the recommendation is that they be transferred out of CIARDS. One accepted gracefully, and the other apparently a little reluctantly, so he will just get a letter so advising him. Are we all agreed on these? Fine.

Okay.

I have a memo here which I will read to you.

The next two are

Just to give you some background here, last Friday when I presented

25X1A9a to the Director the request by the presented, a chauffeur, that his retirement be deferred for one year, we philosophized about the retirement policy for our senior chauffeurs. The Director said that (Ernest

had already spoken to him about a deferment of a year or more when he reaches age 60 in I believe sometime in 1972. Recognizing that an exception for one of these chauffeurs would set a precedent for all the rest, the Director agreed that we should be flexible for this particular group of employees up to the age of 61, but that we should be very firm thereafter. This is of course with the understanding that they continue to turn in a very strong if not an outstanding performance and that they pass rigorous physical examinations each year.

. . . The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m. . .